

## THE SCHOOL BOOK QUESTION ONCE MORE.

Since the article upon this subject in another column of this issue has been put in type, we have received a copy of the announcement of the annual school meeting in Bourbon county, in which the county superintendent, Mrs. E. S. P. Stiteler, gives some reasons why, in her opinion, county uniformity should be agreed upon at this meeting. The importance of the subject, as it relates to the interests of the people, leads us to comment upon the reasons assigned for such action.

We do not doubt the good intentions of the superintendent, but we do question the wisdom of the course she recommends just at this time. Let us see what there is in her claims. They are as follows:

## REASONS WHY BOURBON COUNTY SHOULD HAVE COUNTY UNIFORMITY OF BOOKS.

1. We are now at the mercy of the book companies; they name their price and we have to pay it or not buy.

2. No two districts have just the same books. When a man moves new books must be bought, or his children can not be classified in our schools.

3. As actual facts many renters' children are kept out of school because father cannot afford to get them new books so often.

4. Last year the American Book Company put her paid men to work in this county to defeat county uniformity.

Why? Because, if carried, it meant cheaper books and less sales.

Let us resolve that we will choose our own books, put the companies under contract and not be at their mercy, and these contracts shall be good for five years, unless the state adopts state uniformity, at which time they shall become null and void.

In replying to the above in detail it may be stated, first, that school book publishers sell their books to individual districts as cheap as to entire counties, so that the adoption of county uniformity would not result in an any benefit to the people so far as price is concerned, as long as it would open no new sources for the purchase of books; and inasmuch as the adoption of county uniformity would compel many districts to buy an entirely new outfit at once, and inasmuch as the next legislature will unquestionably take some action upon the subject that may necessitate another entire change, we cannot see the wisdom of Mrs. Stiteler's recommendation at this stage of the game. The people have no money to throw away in making a change of text books that will be liable to be changed again by legislative action inside of the six months following.

Second—She asserts that no two districts in the county have just the same books, and that when a man moves new books must be bought or his children cannot be classified. Admitting all the inconveniences the lady claims in case of families moving, the number that actually move from place to place in the county must be exceedingly small in comparison with the number that would be compelled to make the change if her statement is even approximately correct. But we are inclined to regard that statement as an exaggeration. If it is correct it must follow that inasmuch as there are over one hundred districts in the county, there must be fifty different kinds of readers, fifty different kinds of spellers, fifty different kinds of geographies, fifty different kinds of histories, fifty different

kinds of grammars, and fifty different kinds of each text book in use in the county. Is this strictly correct?

What are the facts? The law requires the district clerks of the several districts to make reports of the school books in use, and these reports show that about fifty of the districts in the county use McGuffey's readers, McGuffey's spellers, Ray's arithmetics, Eclectic geographies and Spencerian copy books, and that one half the remainder use Appleton's readers, Robinson's arithmetics, Swinton's geographies, Barnes' history, Harvey's grammars and Eclectic copy books; while the balance of the districts use a mixture. These being the facts it is difficult to see just why a sweeping change should be made under the existing condition of affairs.

Third—If there is any force in the argument that many renters' children are kept out of school because the parents cannot afford to buy new books so often, it is the very best argument in the world why those people should not now be compelled to buy new books throughout just on the eve of presumably certain legislative action that will unquestionably necessitate another change at a very early day.

As to the last reason assigned we cannot speak, nor do we consider it a point worth considering at this time. Admitting it to be true it would not justify the action proposed. This is not a question just now of contest with a book company. It is simply a question of what is best for the people; and we fail to see any reason to justify the sweeping change in text books that the adoption of county uniformity would imply when it is morally certain that another change may be rendered necessary by legislative action in six months after the adoption of such uniformity by counties.

It may be thought by some that this is a question in which we are not directly interested and concerning which we should not therefore have so much to say. In one sense that may be true, but it must be remembered that in the adoption of county uniformity by the county boards the masses of the people are not consulted, and yet they are bound by the action that may be taken. It is in their interest that we speak, and we earnestly hope that no hasty action may be taken in this matter. Let county boards consider well all the circumstances in the case and consult the best interests of the people whom their action will affect, and in our judgment they will agree with us that this is a good thing to let alone just now.

## WHY NOT MAKE IT UNANIMOUS?

Nearly every convention that assembles adopts the leading features of the People's party platform. They have done so thus far without giving credit. It must be conceded that our platform is very nearly right, or it would not meet with such universal approval. Such being the case, what is the use of the other parties, anyhow? Why not make it unanimous?

## FALSE AS USUAL.

The Kansas City Journal, which is always to be discredited in all things relating to its political opponents, has a report of the Democratic meeting at Lawrence on the evening of the 14th, from which we clip the following:

The whole number in attendance was, by actual count, just fifty-four, and at least one-third of these were Republicans who came to see the fun, while the count included also ten small boys.

The "ratification" was a most ignominious failure, and those who undertook to make speeches could think of nothing to say to justify their cowardly surrender of principle. The proceedings were more like a funeral than a ratification meeting, and when it was over everyone who had taken part hurried home as though they were ashamed to be seen in the neighborhood.

The Democrats of Douglas county, with the exception of perhaps a dozen who deem themselves bosses of the party, are against fusion, and unless they are given a straight ticket, they will stay at home or vote the Republican ticket.

The Lawrence Journal, (Rep.) gives this report:

Douglas county Democrats held a meeting at Odd Fellows' hall last night. There was a good attendance of the Democratic leaders. They endorsed the action of the Democrats in state convention at Topeka solely because they thought it was the only chance of defeating the Republicans and of getting other men in the state house. The gathering was entirely harmonious, not a single voice being raised against the selling out of the party.

The Lawrence Record, also Republican, makes this statement:

The Democrats, or rather all who could stand the heat, met at I. O. O. F. hall last night, and though it was hot, thoroughly enjoyed themselves in the anticipation of a victory this fall over the Republicans.

The Record also has the following editorial reference to the meeting:

Col. Moore made a good hit last night at the Democratic meeting. He said that the Democrats of Lawrence, with one exception, accepted the decision of the state convention as politic and wise. The solitary exception was furnished by a state official appointed by a Republican governor, as a practical mechanic, who proposed to signalize his eternal devotion to Democratic principles by voting the Republican ticket.

It will thus be seen that the "rat" sheet at the mouth of the Kaw has, as usual, manufactured its report without any regard whatever to the facts. It stands convicted of deliberate falsehood by Republican testimony.

Mr. J. E. Riggs offered the following resolution at this meeting, which was unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That we deeply sympathize with the Lawrence Journal and our fellow citizens of the Republican party who seem to be in such deep distress because of what they are pleased to term the surrender and disbursement of the Democratic party of Kansas, and we trust that a benignant providence may give them grace to bear their deep affliction and prepare them for the greater affliction of overwhelming defeat which we propose to aid in giving them at the polls in November.

It is to be hoped our Republican friends will be able to get some consolation out of this sympathy. It seems to be about all there is for them this year.

## PEOPLE'S PARTY PAPERS WILL NOT STOOP TO THE PLANE OF INFAMY OCCUPIED BY THOSE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

Mrs. Laura M. Johns tendered her services to the Republican committee yesterday, and will canvass the state in the interests of the party. The eastern people who have been listening to the rantings of Mrs. Lease will now have an opportunity to learn that the latter is not a representative of her sex in Kansas.—Lawrence Journal.

Mrs. Johns is a lady of culture and refinement, as is also Mrs. Lease. Were People's party papers to be governed by the precedents established by those of the Republican party, their columns would now be filled with the vilest slanders upon the character of Mrs. Johns and the most vulgar allusions to her person and her labors; and with just as much

and precisely the same reason that prompts the low down allusions to Mrs. Lease—the fact simply that she is politically opposed to us. We expect the public utterances of Mrs. Johns to stand or fall solely upon their merits, and these will be legitimately subject to criticism. Her character is unimpeachable. When any People's party paper or speaker shall sink so low as to speak of her personally except in terms of the highest respect, it will be to the everlasting disgrace and reproach of the party. Any paper or any person who speaks otherwise of any woman who may be engaged on either side of this great conflict deserves, and should receive, only the contempt of all decent people. A cause that is sought to be sustained by slander and by personal insult either of men or women, such as has always characterized the Republican press, is certainly hard up for campaign material, and when the subject of such vilification is a woman, the depravity of the assailant is doubly despicable, and the Lawrence Journal in this respect is among the most depraved of its class.

## A SHALLOW PRETENSE.

Senator Palmer says that the Republican claim that Pinkertons are excluded by Republican made laws from the state of Illinois, is false. He says those pretended laws are a delusion and a snare. This is evidently true, as Chicago is, and has been, Pinkerton's headquarters for years. Republican made laws, except when made to serve the interests of corporations and capitalists, are always a delusion and a snare. Take Senator Sherman's anti-trust law as an example. Will some good Republican cite us to a single trust that has been suppressed or the profits of its business in any way curtailed by the operation of this law. Don't all speak at once.

This McKinley bill may possibly be the cause of the strike at Homestead.—Emporia Republican.

Oh, rats! Who ever said anything about the McKinley bill being the cause of the strike at Homestead? Why do you dodge the real issue by this tomfoolery? Your party claims that the protective policy of the Republican party protects American labor. The Homestead trouble proves this pretense a fraud. While Mr. Carnegie is protected against the pauper labor of Europe in foreign manufacturing, his men are not protected against the importation of that same pauper labor by which they are to be displaced. Please meet the true issue and not a fictitious one of your own creation.

## THE PEOPLE FOOT THE BILL.

The military forces sent to aid Mr. Frick in displacing the "protected" laborers at the Homestead works cost the state of Pennsylvania \$22,000 per day. In addition to this, under the laws of Pennsylvania the county in which the works are located is liable for all damages the company may sustain in consequence of the strike. Mr. Carnegie can therefore rest with perfect equanimity in his castle in Scotland, knowing that whatever occurs the people foot the bill.